



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

These sources are probably Jewish. Interesting parallels are adduced from Philo, Yalkut Shimeoni, the *Pirke* of Rabbi Eliezer, etc. The Christian author is thought to have obtained his Jewish material through Ephraem Syrus, whose treatment of the story of Jonah, in his commentary and in his metrical homily on the repentance of the Ninevites, is shown to run parallel in several points. But what is the meaning of the remark that he (Ephraem) gives the scholion of Bar Hebræus about the difference between the Massoretic text and the Septuagint as to the interval to elapse before the destruction of Nineveh?

Dr. Wolf has rendered a service to the history of exegesis in disinterring this Christian Midrash and making its contents available for general use. A full translation, however, would have been welcome.

There is a strange erratum on p. 48: *Hosianna* for *Hesione*.

W. TAYLOR SMITH.

EXETER, ENGLAND.

PHILOLOGY OF THE GOSPELS. By FRIEDRICH BLASS. London: Macmillan & Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. viii + 250. \$1.75.

PROCEEDING from the thesis that Luke's gospel is distinctively a literary work, and discussing the preface to that gospel, Blass takes up, in two chapters, its date. At the close of that, at the end of the fourth chapter, he finds a clear and elegant transition to the subject of textual criticism, which fills the rest of the volume, in the words: "And here we may abandon this subject and pass to considerations of a different order." The writer denounces theologians and their work constantly, and we may suppose that this is a token of the philological training and method which Blass prefers: title, *Philology of the Gospels*; Part I, "Rambling Observations touching the Gospel of St. Luke;" Part II, "Rambling Observations touching the Textual Criticism of the New Testament and in Particular of the Gospels." That is what he seems to have had in mind, though he does not divide and name the parts. The reviewer thinks that this must be a new philological method, seeing that he cannot recall similar examples in the works of eminent philologists.

The unnamed second part opens in chap. 5 with a presentation of the importance and method of textual criticism in the New Testa-

ment; passes to the textual condition of the gospels of Matthew and Luke; treats in chaps. 7-10 of the text of Luke, or of Luke and Acts, and closes with chap. 11 on Mark and 12 on John. In the whole volume only the fifth, eleventh, and twelfth chapters are free from direct, formal reference to one or the other of Luke's two books. If Blass had only enjoyed the methodical instruction of one of the despised theologians, he would have learned that for the material which he presents some such title as "Observations upon the Gospel of St. Luke, with Occasional References to the Remaining Three Gospels," would have been more pertinent. He would also have been taught how to dispose his material logically.

It would be quite impossible, within the bounds of a review, to refer even to the many questions touched upon by Blass in these pages, and he himself insists upon it repeatedly that the reader must turn to his other books upon Luke. The amount of crude reasoning, wild conjecture, and fanciful writing in this volume is out of all proportion to the sober, sound work in it. Four sentences are worth posting, or, as would be said in Germany, worth hanging a little lower, as a token of the spirit congenial to this philological method. After referring to Harnack, one of the most modest of men in spite of his talent, Blass says: "Has that confessedly untrustworthy guide of laymen, scientific theology, after so many errors committed during fifty years, now of a sudden become a trustworthy one? Or have we good reason to mistrust it, as much, or even more, than we had before? In ordinary life no sane person would follow a guide who confessed to having grossly misled him during the whole former part of a journey. Evidently that guide was either utterly ignorant of the way, or he had some views and aims of his own, of which the traveler was unaware [*not* aware], and he cannot be assumed now to have acquired a full knowledge, or to have laid those views and aims wholly aside" (see pp. 35, 36). On p. 179 he writes: "The audacity and presumption of theologians — I speak chiefly of some German theologians — is nowhere exhibited more scandalously than here." It is true that such an arraignment of all scientific theology overreaches itself, and the author himself, in another slightly less offensive passage, on p. 83, shows that there is even for him no question of returning to the dogma of the "absolute infallibility of the inspired writers, not only in matters of faith, but also in matters of fact." Nevertheless, it is desirable that such remarks be placed clearly before the view of the reading public. If Blass denounces scientific theology, and if he believes, as Weiss, Harnack,

and the reviewer do, that in a very good sense *pectus facit theologum*, it would be in place for him, as a philologico-theological reformer, to display a spirit more worthy of Neander and of his motto. In so far as Blass, in this English book, casts more than once a slur upon German theologians in particular, he certainly has forgotten the familiar German proverb touching the character of the bird which defiles its own nest.

Let us look at one passage, which it seems possible to consider briefly, and that without positive need of turning to Blass' other books. It is the interesting passage about the adulterous woman, the passage interpolated at John 7:53—8:11, and Blass discusses it on pp. 155—64. Blass believes that he can distinguish two forms of Luke and of the Acts. Please observe now the sentence on pp. 162—3: "As long as the chain of external and internal evidence remains unbroken, by which it is proved that the section about the adulteress is both Lucan and absent from the oriental Luke, we have in it the firm proof for the existence of a different early Roman Luke, that is, for the existence of two authentic forms of Luke." The untutored mind of the layman whom Blass is now trying to rescue from the clutches of scientific theology will certainly suppose that there is a "chain of external and internal evidence" to remain unbroken, and that Blass has "firm proof" for his ingeniously supported theory. Should a glance at the state of the case fail to discover the evidence here, laymen, or even the pernicious scientific theologians, cannot be blamed for thinking that Blass is badly off for proofs. The reviewer may simplify the case by saying that he thinks that the story may very well be authentic and as old as, even though it does not belong in one of, our four gospels. First, what is the chain of external evidence from our thousands of manuscripts with the translations and the Fathers? A few late Greek minuscule manuscripts, all, apparently, leading to one older manuscript, and that older manuscript by no means to be put upon a level with the great uncials. No translation has the passage here, not even the Latin. No Father has the passage here. To speak plainly, the "chain of external" evidence is not even a single full link. It is not much more than a freak of evidence. And, to make the confusion complete, Blass, in the face of his feeble link, strikes off their first sentence and puts the passage two verses earlier! Really, with such vagaries, one must be thankful that Blass leaves a sound verse in the whole New Testament. Philological method, indeed! Such method would make Bentley, Ernesti, and Ritschl turn in their graves. But if the external

chain be so invisible, surely the chain of internal evidence must be very firmly welded. Where do we find the internal evidence? In two points: first, in the fact that the passage fits so "wonderfully" after Blass has put it two verses farther back than his lame external evidence permits, and I contend that that is worse than no internal evidence; it is internal evidence for a place in which the verses are not even to be found in that freak of testimony in those few minuscules. And, nevertheless, Blass is so much pleased with the result that he writes: "I venture to say that this connection is so perfect that it cannot be the result of chance, but must really go back to the author," and he actually adduces, as a literary parallel, Acts 15: 41—16: 4; 18: 1-3, 4. No philologically, or I might, perhaps, say theologically, trained man would believe that a scholar could print such sentences. The second point is the fact that the style is pronounced to be Luke's. This Blass has proved, he says, in another book. I cannot think that his proof there is better than the proof we have just seen here. I suppose that he presses the words common also to Luke and explains the words not in Luke as individualities of Luke in this passage; Blass suggests similar proofs elsewhere in this book; and just as feeble proofs have, I regret to say, sometimes been used by that "scientific theology" which Blass so much deprecates. There is the whole proof. Then Blass gives, on pp. 159-63, three pages of "ifs" and of suppositions, not worth one straw for the consideration of the question, seeing that there is no proof for the whole position, and closes with that remarkable sentence as to "firm proof." Blass should go to Harnack and learn method.

CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY.

UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG,
Germany.

THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT. Edited by W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D. Complete in 5 vols. Vol. I: *The Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke*, by REV. PROFESSOR ALEXANDER BALMAIN BRUCE; and *The Gospel of John*, by REV. PROFESSOR MARCUS DODS, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. Pp. viii + 872. Cloth, \$7.50.

ALFORD'S Greek Testament has been for more than a generation the most widely used of all English commentaries on the Greek text. The volume containing the gospels appeared in 1849, the fourth and concluding volume in 1860. Its comprehensive scope, constructive